AN 2 7 2003 (3) 14 6

Attorney Docket No. 663/35631 PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s):

Adcock et al.

Serial No.:

09/254.148

Art Unit:

2761

Filed:

June 11, 1999

Examiner:

Akers

For:

AUTOMATIC ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER SYSTEM AND

METHOD

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL

(Box After Final)
Honorable Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the official Final Office Action dated October 29, 2002 and the productive interview of January 27, 2003, Applicant makes the following remarks:

Claims 1-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rose et al. in view of Gifford. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed to in the interview, Rose by itself or in combination with Gifford does not teach the present invention. Thus, the Final Office Action will be removed and either the case will be passed to issue or a new non-final office action will be issued based on an updated search.

Claim 1 is directed to a system for automatically conducting a business transaction between a user and a trader. It includes a trader terminal having billing information representative of the trader and a user terminal or user card associated with a user terminal. A local communication link is provided between the user terminal or user card and the trader terminal. An order of goods and/or services of the trader is initiated by transmitting data over the link, using a message protocol, from said user terminal to be received by the trader terminal. The user terminal or user card receives and processes user information representative of the user. The user terminal or user card receives and processes billing information via the link in response to the order. A communication network enables the user terminal to communicate with a service provider. The user terminal transmits the billing

information and the user information to the service provider over the communication network. The service provider automatically transmits the funds of the user to the trader under authorization of the user to effect a financial transaction between the user and the trader.

It should be noted that the method of Claim 36 has similar limitations.

The distinctions are that Rose is a seller driven/controlled system, not a buyer driven/controlled system. Rose uses one channel of communication between the buyer, seller and service provider instead of separate channels of communication between the buyer and seller and the buyer and service provider.

Based on the above arguments, Claim 1 is considered allowable over the art of record. Also, the method of Claim 36 provides a method including the local communication network being distinctive from the communication network and that the user terminal is in control of the transactions. Gifford does not correct the failings of Rose nor teach the specific modification. It is not obvious how one of ordinary skill in the art would modify the teachings of Rose with Gifford to meet the limitations of the claims.

The dependent claims are allowable for their own distinctive limitations, as well as those argued herein with respect to Claims 1 and 36.

An earnest attempt has been made to respond to the Examiner's rejections to place the application in condition for allowance. Upon review of the arguments, it will be evident that Claims 1-56 are allowable over the art of record. Thus, passage of this case to issue is respectfully solicited.

It is respectfully requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response and shortages in other fees be charged, or any overpayment in fees be credited, to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg, Deposit Account No. 02-1010 (663/35631).

Respectfully submitted,

BARNES & THORNBURG

Perry Palan Reg. No. 26,213

(202) 289-1313

BARNES & THORNBURG

Attorneys at Law

750 17th Street N.W. Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20006-4675 (202) 289-1313

Fax Number: (202) 289-1330

FAX	CO	VER	SHEE	\mathbf{T}

NAME

COMPANY NAME

TELECOPY NO.

TO:

SIR/MADAM

USPTO

703 746-7239

FROM: William Bryant

DIRECT DIAL: 202 408-6908

E-MAIL:

DATE:

March 7, 2003

TIME SENDING:

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET):

If you have difficulty receiving this Fax, please call Barnes & Thornburg at and ask for _

our ref: 663/35631 09/254,148

Spoke with examiner Dr. Geoffrey Akers on March 7, 2003 about status of application no. 09/254,148. Enclosed is a Request For Reconsideration After Final that was filed on January 27, 2003, USPTO has no record of this filing. Please add this to your file and forward any correspondence regarding this application.

Official .

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 1 1 2003

GROUP 3600

Call Once Received Response once received:

CLIENT# MATTER# 35631

663

☐ Original to follow by mail

☑ Original will not follow by mail

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and is confidential. If you are not the addressee or an employee or agent of the addressee responsible for delivering it to the addressee, please do not read, use, disclose, copy or distribute this message and do not take any action in reliance upon it. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (collect) to arrange for its return. We do not intend to waive any attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

Indianapolis

Fort Wayne

South Bend

Elkhart

Chicago

Washington, D.C.

Patent (a) Serial No. 09/354, 148 Applicant(s) Adcock	Trademark Filed et at.	June 11, 1999 JAN 27 2003
Papers filed herewith on		
☐ Fees \$ New-Formal Application ☐ Amendment ☐ Notice of Appeal Brief ☐ Other Keguitation	D B	Assignment Proposed Drawing Correction Priority Document(s) Req. for Ext. of Time Sheets ofFormal Drawings
Receipt is hereby acknowledge identified case.		filed as indicated in connection with above